UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,370	10/15/2003	Masashi Eguchi	031182	3371

38834 7590 02/18/2009
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
PACHOL, NICHOLAS C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/684,370	**Applicant(s)** EGUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner Nicholas C. Pachol	**Art Unit** 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 October 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 3-11, filed 10/30/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 8, and 15 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551).

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 1, 8, and 15 recites the limitation "a page" in lines 4, 6, and 4 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claims should be amended to state said at least one page.

6. Claim 1, 8, and 15 recites the limitation "said page" in lines 6, 8, and 6 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claims should be amended to state said at least one page.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551).

Regarding Claim 1, Tonegawa teaches a facsimile machine (Figure 1, element 20) comprising:

means for scanning an original document having at least one page to be transmitted (Figure 1, element 1 and Column 5, lines 65-67);

means for generating image data of said at least one page for a facsimile communication (Column 7, lines 35-42);

means for serially converting the image data of a page of said original document for the facsimile communication into packets as electronic mail data (Column 2, line 65 -

Column 3, line 13, since the network is packet based, the image is sent via packets, wherein a packet communication network, is a packet based network. This means that the e-mails must be sent via packets. It does not what that the image data is combine with the header data because the e-mail must be sent via packets based on being the packet communication network. Therefore the image data is transformed into packets.); and

means for serially transmitting the electronic mail data in the form of electronic mail for each packet (Column 13, lines 50-54).

Tonegawa does not teach said converting occurring in parallel with the scanning of said page of the original document.

However, Peek does teach said converting occurring in parallel with the scanning of said page of the original document (Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 4 and Column 6, lines 29-31, wherein the fax type data is the packets of the pages because sending an e-mail via a fax is packet based. The fax machine includes the method to send via an e-mail, Column 3, lines 20-25, and Column 4, lines 36-52, therefore it is a packet-based network. The examiner is taking this as to be inherent in that the image data is being transmitted as packets.).

Tonegawa and Peek are combinable because they both teach sending faxes via electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa with the teachings of

Peek for the purpose of speeding the fax process by concurrently transmitting the fax type data to known fax machine as it is generated as taught by Peek (Peek: Column 6, lines 29-31, and Column 6, lines 38-41).

Regarding Claim 8, Tonegawa teaches a facsimile machine (Figure 1, element 20) comprising:

a scanning unit which scans an original document having at least one page to be transmitted (Figure 1, element 1 and Column 5, lines 65-67);

a generating unit which generates image data of said at least one page for a facsimile communication (Column 7, lines 35-42);

a data conversion unit which serially converts the image data of a page of said original document for the facsimile communication into plurality of packets as electronic mail data (Column 2, line 65 - Column 3, line 13, since the network is packet based, the image is sent via packets, wherein a packet communication network, is a packet based network. This means that the e-mails must be sent via packets. It does not what that the image data is combine with the header data because the e-mail must be sent via packets based on being the packet communication network. Therefore the image data is transformed into packets.); and

a serial transmission unit which serially transmits the electronic mail data for each packet of the plurality of packets in a form of electronic mail (Column 13, lines 50-54).

However, Peek does teach said converting occurring in parallel with the scanning of said page of the original document (Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 4 and Column 6, lines 29-31, wherein the fax type data is the packets of the pages because sending an e-mail via a fax is packet based. The fax machine includes the method to send via an e-mail, Column 3, lines 20-25, and Column 4, lines 36-52, therefore it is a packet-based network. The examiner is taking this as to be inherent in that the image data is being transmitted as packets.).

Tonegawa and Peek are combinable because they both teach sending faxes via electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa with the teachings of Peek for the purpose of speeding the fax process by concurrently transmitting the fax type data to known fax machine as it is generated as taught by Peek (Peek: Column 6, lines 29-31, and Column 6, lines 38-41).

Regarding Claim 15, Tonegawa teaches a facsimile transmission method (Column 3, lines 14-17) comprising:

scanning an original document having at least one page to be transmitted (Figure 1, element 1 and Column 5, line 65);

generating image data of said at least one page for a facsimile communication (Column 7, lines 35-42);

converting the image data of a page of said original document for the facsimile communication serially into plurality of packets as electronic mail data (Column 2, line 65 - Column 3, line 13, since the network is packet based, the image is sent via packets, wherein a packet communication network, is a packet based network. This means that the e-mails must be sent via packets. It does not what that the image data is combine with the header data because the e-mail must be sent via packets based on being the packet communication network. Therefore the image data is transformed into packets.); and

transmitting the electronic mail data serially for each packet of the plurality of packets in a form of electronic mail for each packet of the plurality of packets (Column 13, lines 50-54).

However, Peek does teach said converting occurring in parallel with the scanning of said page of the original document (Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 4 and Column 6, lines 29-31, wherein the fax type data is the packets of the pages because sending an e-mail via a fax is packet based. The fax machine includes the method to send via an e-mail, Column 3, lines 20-25, and Column 4, lines 36-52, therefore it is a packet-based network. The examiner is taking this as to be inherent in that the image data is being transmitted as packets.).

Tonegawa and Peek are combinable because they both teach sending faxes via electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa with the teachings of

Peek for the purpose of speeding the fax process by concurrently transmitting the fax type data to known fax machine as it is generated as taught by Peek (Peek: Column 6, lines 29-31, and Column 6, lines 38-41).

9. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551) further in view of Kisono (US 6,906,829).

Regarding Claim 2, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach the facsimile machine, further comprising: means for generating image data for a facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying the receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document.

However, Kisono does teach the facsimile machine, further comprising: means for generating image data for a facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying the receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document (Column 11, lines 28-41 and Column 12, lines 38-46 and Figure 11, elements S114 and S115).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Kisono are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with

Kisono for the purpose of the network facsimile apparatus can efficiently receive the facsimile image information (Kisono: Column 11, lines 41-42).

Regarding Claim 9, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach the an image data generating unit which generates image data for facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying a receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document.

However, Kisono does teach an image data generating unit which generates image data for facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying a receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document (Column 11, lines 28-41 and Column 12, lines 38-46 and Figure 11, elements S114 and S115).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Kisono are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Kisono for the purpose of the network facsimile apparatus can efficiently receive the facsimile image information (Kisono: Column 11, lines 41-42).

Regarding Claim 16, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach the generating image data for a facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying a receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document.

However, Kisono does teach generating image data for a facsimile communication according to a receiving ability of a destination by identifying a receiving ability of the destination prior to the scanning of the original document (Column 11, lines 28-41 and Column 12, lines 38-46 and Figure 11, elements S114 and S115).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Kisono are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Kisono for the purpose of the network facsimile apparatus can efficiently receive the facsimile image information (Kisono: Column 11, lines 41-42).

10. Claims 3, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551) further in view of Murata (US 7,139,088).

Regarding Claim 3, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach means for determining readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission; and means for transmitting a connection holding command to the destination to hold the connection established with the destination when the means for determining determines that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready.

However Murata '088 teaches means for determining readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open); and

means for transmitting a connection holding command to the destination to hold the connection established with the destination when the means for determining determines that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Murata '088 are combinable because they both teach sending fax by electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Murata ‘088 for the purpose of keeping the connection established to completely transmit the e-mail (Murata: Column 5, lines 40-44).

Regarding Claim 10, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach a determining unit which determines readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission; and a connection holding unit which transmits a connection holding command to the destination to hold the connection established with the destination when the determining unit determines that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready.

However Murata ‘088 does teach a determining unit which determines readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open); and

a connection holding unit which transmits a connection holding command to the destination to hold the connection established with the destination when the determining unit determines that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Murata '088 are combinable because they both teach sending fax by electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Murata ‘088 for the purpose of keeping the connection established to completely transmit the e-mail (Murata: Column 5, lines 40-44).

Regarding Claim 17, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach determining readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission; and transmitting a connection holding command to the destination to hold a connection established with the destination when it is determined that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready.

However Murata ‘088 does teach determining readiness of electronic mail data to be transmitted next in the serial electronic mail transmission (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open); and

transmitting a connection holding command to the destination to hold a connection established with the destination when it is determined that the electronic mail data to be transmitted next is not ready (Figure 3, elements S8 and S14 and Column 5, lines 24-247 and 40-44, where if the data is not ready it cannot be sent, so therefore the connection would stay open).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Murata '088 are combinable because they both teach sending fax by electronic mail.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Murata ‘088 for the purpose of keeping the connection established to completely transmit the e-mail (Murata: Column 5, lines 40-44).

11. Claims 4, 11, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551) further in view of Wu (6,519,051).

Regarding Claim 4, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach an operation unit which accepts an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission; and

means for disconnecting a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when the operation unit accepts the instruction to stop the transmission.

However Wu does teach an operation unit which accepts an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission (Column 14, lines 29-31); and

means for disconnecting a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when the operation unit accepts the instruction to stop the transmission (Column 14, lines 31-37).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Wu are combinable because they all teaching transmitting a document with a fax machine.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Wu for the purpose of enabling connections to any device (Wu: Column 13, lines 42-50).

Regarding Claim 11, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach an operation unit which accepts an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission; and a connection stopping unit which disconnects a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when the operation unit accepts the instruction to stop the transmission.

However Wu does teach an operation unit which accepts an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission (Column 14, lines 29-31); and

a connection stopping unit which disconnects a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when the operation unit accepts the instruction to stop the transmission.

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Wu are combinable because they all teaching transmitting a document with a fax machine.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Wu for the purpose of enabling connections to any device (Wu: Column 13, lines 42-50).

Regarding Claim 18, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach accepting an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission; and

disconnecting a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when accepting the instruction to stop the transmission.

However Wu does teach accepting an instruction to stop a transmission in the serial electronic mail transmission (Column 14, lines 29-31); and disconnecting a connection by transmitting to the destination, a connection stopping command to stop the connection established with the destination when accepting the instruction to stop the transmission.

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Wu are combinable because they all teaching transmitting a document with a fax machine.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Wu for the purpose of enabling connections to any device (Wu: Column 13, lines 42-50).

12. Claims 5, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551) further in view of Reifman (US 5,438,433).

Regarding Claim 5, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach the notifying and selecting to notify of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination and to select either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail, when the connection failed to be established with the destination in the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Reifman does teach notifying and selecting to notify of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination and to select either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail, when the connection failed to be established with the destination in the transmission of the electronic mail (Column 49, Exceptions and Figure 103 and Column 56, 11-24 where a busy signal is the form of a transmission error).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Reifman are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Reifman for the purpose of notifying the operator of the error (Reifman: Column 4, lines 2-5).

Regarding Claim 12, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach a notifying and selecting unit which notifies of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination when the connection failed to be established with the destination in the transmission of the electronic mail, and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Reifman does teach a notifying and selecting unit which notifies of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination when the connection failed to be established with the destination in the transmission of the electronic mail, and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail (Column 49, Exceptions and Figure 103 and Column 56, lines 11-24 where a busy signal is the form of a transmission error).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Reifman are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Reifman for the purpose of notifying the operator of the error (Reifman: Column 4, lines 2-5).

Regarding Claim 19, Tonegawa in view of Peek does not teach the notifying of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination when the connection failed to be established with the destination in a transmission of the electronic mail, and selecting either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Reifman does teach notifying of a fact that a connection failed to be established with the destination when the connection failed to be established with the destination in a transmission of the electronic mail, and selecting either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail (Column 49, Exceptions and Figure 103 and Column 56, 11-24 where a busy signal is the form of a transmission error).

Tonegawa in view of Peek and Reifman are combinable because they both teach fax machines.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek with Reifman for the purpose of notifying the operator of the error (Reifman: Column 4, lines 2-5).

13. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonegawa (US 7,136,184) in view of Peek (6,614,551) further in view of Reifman (US 5,438,433) and further in view of Murata (US 2004/0012806).

Regarding Claim 6, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach wherein the means for notifying and selecting notifies of the contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Murata ‘086 teaches wherein the means for notifying and selecting notifies of the contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 29) and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 30).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 7, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach stopping the transmission of the electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and the contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued.

However, Murata ‘086 does teach stopping the transmission of the electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and the contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued (Page 3, Paragraph 31).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 13, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach wherein the notifying and selecting unit notifies of contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail, and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Murata ‘086 further teaches wherein the notifying and selecting unit notifies of contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 29), and selects either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 30).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 14, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach a transmission stopping unit which stops a transmission of an electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and the contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued.

However, Murata ‘086 teaches a transmission stopping unit which stops a transmission of an electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and the contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued (Page 3, Paragraph 31).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 20, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach notifying of contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail, and selecting either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail.

However, Murata ‘086 teaches notifying of contents of a transmission error when detecting a transmission error in the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 29), and selecting either to continue or stop the transmission of the electronic mail (Page 3, Paragraph 30).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 21, Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman does not teach stopping the transmission of the electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued.

However, Murata ‘086 teaches stopping the transmission of the electronic mail by notifying of a fact that the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued when a transmission error is detected in the transmission of the electronic mail and contents of the transmission error correspond to a state in which the transmission of the electronic mail cannot be continued (Page 3, Paragraph 31).

Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman and Murata ‘086 are combinable because they both deal with transmission of image data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tonegawa in view of Peek further in view of Reifman with

Murata ‘086 for the purpose of informing the user of the error to decide what action to take in regards to the error (Murata ‘086: Page 1, Paragraph 4).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr, 8:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.P.
02/12/09

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625